Smith's Report

No. 171 ***Challenging the Holocaust Taboo Since 1990*** **April 2010**

Dogma, Double Standards, and Doubt: The Bradley Smith Heresy and Beyond

by Michael K. Smith

To act is to be committed, and to be committed is to be in danger.
—James Baldwin, The Fire Next Time

In his autobiography *Break His Bones* Bradley Smith gives us a lively and infuriating review of the Holocaust dogma that has crippled intellectual freedom in the U.S. It should be required reading for every course with an Elie Wiesel book on the class reading list. While sympathetic to Jewish suffering, it dispassionately analyzes the fantastical claims made by Holocaust eyewitnesses, including mass gassing chambers, lampshades made of human skin, soap made from Jewish cadavers, and towering geysers spurting human blood for months on end in the wake of Nazi atrocities in Europe. Maintaining a steady, ironic tone throughout, the author details the intellectual cowardice of college professors, the craven submissiveness of the corporate media, and the fanatical zeal of Holocaustomaniacs.

This remarkable achievement has not come without a price. Holocaust Industry fanatics routinely slander Smith, disrupt his speaking engagements, prevent circulation of his work, keep him on the brink of financial ruin, and threaten to kill him, his wife, and his children.

Maintaining a steady, ironic tone throughout, the author details the intellectual cowardice of college professors, the craven submissiveness of the corporate media, and the fanatical zeal of Holocaustomaniacs.

Nevertheless, Smith persists in pointing out the wild implausibilities in the conventional Holocaust narrative, as he has for three decades, and calls for an open debate on the topic on U.S. college campuses. Though no such debate has yet taken place, his tireless efforts to give sanity a chance have left the Holocaust Industry looking increasingly ridiculous.

At the root of this mother-of-all-industries is a Judeocentric self-obsession that simply will not face reality—or let anyone else do so either. James Baldwin explained the problem well in his famous letter to his nephew on the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. Noting that the illusion of black inferiority had long served as the anchor of white identity, Baldwin told his nephew that white people couldn't help but feel alarm in the face of a black freedom movement that attacked their very sense of reality. "Try to imagine how you would feel if you woke up one morning to find the sun shining and all the stars aflame," wrote Uncle James. "You would be frightened because it is out of the order of nature." And violations of nature cannot be assimilated. "The black man has functioned in the white man's world

as a fixed star, as an immovable pillar," he observed, "and as he moves out of his place, heaven and earth are shaken to their foundations."

Among Jews, orthodox belief in the Holocaust has functioned as an immovable pillar, so that any skepticism about mass gassing chambers threatens to bring the Temple of Eternal Victimhood crashing down upon their heads. Having long built Jewish identity around a narrative of 2000+ years of unmerited suffering culminating in "extermination" in Nazi gas chambers, organized Jewry cannot easily accept that key aspects of the story may be as much legend as factual description, as much myth as reality. Confronted by Smith's skepticism, they do not debate what they consider to be his intellectual errors, but rather, smear him as Nazi-sympathizing scum.

Though it is often claimed that "tons" of captured German documents prove beyond doubt that the Nazis attempted to exterminate Jews in gas chambers, in fact documents are scarce, and their interpretation is very much disputed. As a result, the Holocaust narrative has become almost solely dependent on the testimony of martyrs. But eyewitness testimony is notoriously unreliable, especially from those who were held in conditions ripe for the flourishing of collective hysteria. "History is filled with stories of masses of people claiming to be eyewitnesses to everything from sexual union with the Devil to abductions by moon men in flying saucers," Smith observes. How "anti-Semitic" of him to notice.

The situation being what it is, Smith gets almost no support among U.S. college professors, who meekly submit to Holocaust Industry tyranny, even as they piously declare their (imaginary) belief in free speech. While they may be in favor of free speech in the abstract, as soon as they encounter the slightest doubt about homicidal gas chambers they are reduced to Holocaust Industry sound bites that divert attention from the disputed facts to the alleged sinister motives of those who seek to have them investigated.

Like Holocaust Industry lobbyists, the professors insist there can be no "other side" to the gas chamber story, because Holocaust revisionists are hateful people with an "agenda," and so cannot arrive at the truth the way the dispassionate professors allegedly do. This is the educational equivalent of Israel's claim that it can find no partner for peace, only terrorist maniacs intent on continuing Nazism by other means. If Bradley Smith doesn't realize by now that Jewish apartheid is inherently noble because mass gassing chambers are inherently credible—and vice versa—so much the worse for him. Such is the level of intellectual sophistication at U.S. colleges, now charging tens of thousands of dollars a year for the privilege of becoming associated with them.

Given the ban on open Holocaust debate, *Break His Bones* might just as well have been titled *Free Speech: An Autopsy*. "Every institution of higher learning cooperates in the suppression of revisionist scholarship," Smith notes. "No book or periodical distributor will handle revisionist publications" and "no philanthropic organization will contribute funds to revisionist research." For Smith, this is a spiritual issue, not a political one, since you either want free speech "for others as well as for yourself or you don't really want it." Minds that have mastered Aristotle, Spinoza, Kant, Hegel, and Nietzsche find these words impenetrable.

Here is the dismal sequence of speech suppression at U.S. universities. After Smith places an ad calling for free discussion of the Holocaust, agents of the Holocaust Industry express indignation that heretical ideas are being given a public platform. Devoid of shame, they contact the president of the university in question, "suggesting" that debating a Holocaust revisionist legitimates racism and must not be tolerated. Then they launch vicious attacks on the heretic, claiming he is lying and implying that he is a genocidal murderer at heart. They accuse the editors and advertising departments of the offending paper with having all of the worst qualities of the revisionist himself. Next, they smear all revisionists as peddlers of hatred and denounce as anti-Semitic the campus organizations that extend them invitations. This performance produces the intended effect: cowed professors and administrators maintain a disgraceful silence and campus libraries and bookstores refuse to shelve revisionist works.

Nor is this all. Thanks to Hillel rabbis, Smith reports, today's American university students are spied on with a thoroughness that puts U.S. intelligence agencies to shame. "Rabbis who work to destroy those who argue for open debate on the Holocaust stories represent a New Inquisition," and are converting the Holocaust into "a quasi-religious cult, complete with an immense crank literature of infallible texts, crazy miracles, saintly eye-witness tales of miraculous escapes from nazi devils," the entire fantastical tale protected

Continued on page 12

Is Gilad Atzmon, in His Turn, Becoming a Revisionist?

by Robert Faurisson

27 March 2010

Born in Israel in 1963, Gilad Atzmon lives in London. As recently as October 27 of last year he said on his website: "I am a proper Zionist Jew […]. I am a Holocaust survivor […]. I am also totally against Holocaust denial […] I oppose Holocaust denial." (http://www.gilad.co.uk/writings/after-all-i-am-a-proper-zionist-jew-by-gilad-atzmon.html)

But, on March 13, 2010, he began developing considerations of a revisionist nature (in the long quotation here, I have quoted what seem to me the most significant parts of this change of attitude).

"When I was young and naïve I regarded history as a serious academic matter. As I understood it, history had something to do with truth seeking, documents, chronology and facts. I was convinced that history aimed to convey a sensible account of the past based on methodical research. I also believed that it was premised on the assumption that understanding the past may throw some light over our present and even help us to shape a prospect of a better future. I grew up in the Jewish state and it took me quite a while to understand that the Jewish historical narrative is very different. In the Jewish intellectual ghetto, one decides what the future ought to be, then one constructs 'a past' accordingly. Interestingly enough, this exact method is also prevalent amongst Marxists. They shape the past so it fits nicely into their vision of the future. As the old Russian joke says, 'when the facts do not conform with the Marxist ideology, the Communist social scientists amend the facts (rather than revise the theory)'.

"When I was young, I didn't think that history was a matter of political decisions or agreements

> ***"The fate of my great-grand-mother was not any different from hundreds of thousands of German civilians who died in an orchestrated indiscriminate bombing, because they were Germans. Similarly, people in Hiroshima died just because they were Japanese. 1 million Vietnamese died just because they were Vietnamese and 1.3 million Iraqis died because they were Iraqis. In short the tragic circumstances of my great grandmother weren't that special after all."***

between a rabid Zionist lobby and its favourite holocaust survivor. I regarded historians as scholars who engaged in adequate research following some strict procedures. When I was young I even considered becoming an historian.

"When I was young and naive I was also somehow convinced that what they told us about our 'collective' Jewish past really happened. I believed it all, the Kingdom of David, Massada, and then the Holocaust: the soap, the lampshade*, the death march, the six million.

"As it happened, it took me many years to understand that the Holocaust, the core belief of the contemporary Jewish faith, was not at all an historical narrative for historical narratives do not need the protection of the law and politicians. It took me years to grasp that my great-grand-mother wasn't made into a 'soap' or a 'lampshade'*. She probably perished out of exhaustion, typhus or maybe even by mass shooting. This was indeed bad and tragic enough, however not that different from the fate of many millions of Ukrainians who learned what communism meant for real. 'Some of the worst mass murderers in history were Jews' writes Zionist Sever Plocker on the Israeli Ynet disclosing the Holodomor and Jewish involvement in this colossal crime, probably the greatest crime of the 20th century.

"The fate of my great-grand-mother was not any different from hundreds of thousands of German civilians who died in an orchestrated indiscriminate bombing, because they were Germans. Similarly, people in Hiroshima died just

because they were Japanese. 1 million Vietnamese died just because they were Vietnamese and 1.3 million Iraqis died because they were Iraqis. In short the tragic circumstances of my great grandmother wasn't that special after all.

"It doesn't make sense.

"It took me years to accept that the Holocaust narrative, in its current form, doesn't make any historical sense. Here is just one little anecdote to elaborate on:

"If, for instance, the Nazis wanted the Jews out of their Reich (*Judenrein* - free of Jews), or even dead, as the Zionist narrative insists, how come they marched hundreds of thousands of them back into the Reich at the end of the war? I have been concerned with this simple question for more than a while. I eventually launched into an historical research of the topic and happened to learn from Israeli Holocaust historian professor Israel Gutman that Jewish prisoners actually joined the march voluntarily. Here is a testimony taken from Gutman's book:

"'One of my friends and relatives in the camp came to me on the night of the evacuation and offered a common hiding place somewhere on the way from the camp to the factory.... The intention was to leave the camp with one of the convoys and to escape near the gate, using the darkness we thought to go a little far from the camp. The temptation was very strong. And yet, after I considered it all I then decided to join (the march) with all the other inmates and to share their fate' (Israel Gutman [editor], People and Ashes: Book Auschwitz-Birkenau, Merhavia 1957).

"I am left puzzled here, if the Nazis ran a death factory in Auschwitz-Birkenau, why would the Jewish prisoners join them at the end of the war? Why didn't the Jews wait for their Red liberators?

"I think that 65 years after the liberation of Auschwitz, we must be entitled to start to ask the necessary questions. We should ask for some conclusive historical evidence and arguments rather than follow a religious narrative that is sustained by political pressure and laws. We should strip the holocaust of its Judeo-centric exceptional status and treat it as an historical chapter that belongs to a certain time and place.

"Sixty-five years after the liberation of Auschwitz we should reclaim our history and ask why? Why were the Jews hated? Why did European people stand up against their next door neighbours? Why are the Jews hated in the Middle East, surely they had a chance to open a new page in their troubled history? If they genuinely planned to do so, as the early Zionists claimed, why did they fail? Why did America tighten its immigration laws amid the growing danger to European Jews? We should also ask for what purpose do the holocaust denial laws serve? What is the holocaust religion there to conceal? As long as we fail to ask questions, we will be subjected to Zionists and their Neocons agents' plots. We will continue killing in the name of Jewish suffering. We will maintain our complicity in Western imperialist crimes against humanity.

"As devastating as it may be, at a certain moment in time, a horrible chapter was given an exceptionally meta-historical status. Its 'factuality' was sealed by draconian laws and its reasoning was secured by social and political settings. The Holocaust became the new Western religion. Unfortunately, it is the most sinister religion known to man. It is a license to kill, to flatten, no [sic, for *to*] nuke, to wipe, to rape, to loot and to ethnically cleanse. It made vengeance and revenge into a Western value. However, far more concerning is the fact that it robs humanity of its heritage, it is there to stop us from looking into our past with dignity. Holocaust religion robs humanity of its humanism. For the sake of peace and future generations, the holocaust must be stripped of its exceptional status immediately. It must be subjected to thorough historical scrutiny. Truth and truth seeking is an elementary human experience. It must prevail."

"*During WWII and after it was widely believed that soaps and lampshades were being mass produced from the bodies of Jewish victims. In recent years the Israeli Holocaust museum admitted that there was no truth in any of those accusations." (http://www.gilad.co.uk/writings/truth-history-and-integrity-by-gilad-atzmon.html)

Finally, on March 25, 2010, his site carried the following statement:

"AIPAC leaders are clearly repeating the grave mistakes of their forbearers [sic, for *forebears*]: the American Jewish Congress. They do not learn from their history, for there is not a single Jewish history text to learn from. Instead of a history text, Jews have the Holocaust, an event that matured into a religion. – The holocaust religion is obviously Judeo-centric to the bone. It defines the Jewish *Raison d'être*. For the Jews it signifies a total fatigue of the Diaspora, it regards the Goy as a potential 'irrational' murderer. The new Jewish religion preaches revenge. It even estab-

lishes a new Jewish God. Instead of old *Yehova*, the new Jewish God is 'the Jew' himself: the brave and witty being, the one who survived the ultimate and most sinister genocide, the one who came out of the ashes and stepped forward into a new beginning.

"To a certain extent the Holocaust religion signals the Jewish departure from monotheism, for every Jew is a potential little God or Goddess. Gilad Shalit is the God 'innocence', Abe Foxman is the God anti Semitism, Maddof [sic, for *Madoff*] is the God of swindling, Greenspan is the God of 'good economy', Lord Goldsmith is the God of the 'green light', Lord Levy is the God of fundraising, Wolfowitz is the God of new American expansionism and AIPAC is the American Olympus where American elected human beings come to ask for mercy and forgiveness for being Goyim and for daring to occasionally tell the truth about Israel. –

"The holocaust religion is the conclusive stage in the Jewish dialectic; it is the end of Jewish history for it is the deepest and most sincere form of 'self love'. Rather than inventing an abstract God who prefers the Jews to be the chosen people, in the holocaust religion the Jews cut out the divine middle substance. The Jew just chooses oneself [sic, for *himself*]. This is why Jewish identity politics transcends itself beyond the notion of history. God is the master of ceremony. And the new Jewish God cannot be subject to humanly contingent occurrences.

"The new Jewish God, i.e. 'the Jew', just re-writes fables that serve the tribe at any given time. This may explain why the Holocaust religion is protected by laws, while every other historical chapter and narrative is debated openly by historians, intellectuals and ordinary people. – As one may guess, with such a self-centered intensive world-view, not much room is left for humanity, grace or universalism. It is far from being clear whether Jews can collectively recover from their new religion. However, it is crucial that every humanist stands up against the holocaust religion that can only spread misery, death and carnage." (http://www.gilad.co.uk/writings/judea-declares-war-on-obama-by-gilad-atzmon.html)

Holocaust History—a Family Matter

by Jett Rucker

In my case, it was very sudden—a moment I could almost place not only on a calendar, but even on a clock. What made that single moment so noticeable was that my wife—my soul mate in matters encompassing the intellectual and far beyond—was telling me she didn't want to hear my opinions on a matter that I had given serious thought to. The matter was Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's complaints about the ways the Holocaust tradition had been hijacked to serve nationalistic, even financial, agendas of interest groups such as Israel and its sympathizers in the United States, and I had referred to those complaints by citing the trenchant title of Norman Finkelstein's book *The Holocaust Industry*. Notice, no actual "denial" in my remarks thus far.

To my unending shock, it set my life's chief intellectual companion off on a tirade such as I had never heard from her, even when I voiced some of the most offensive of the many widely unpopular views I hold (and describe to her on a regular basis). In retrospect, it was understandable, even predictable, given the fact that she, like me, and probably you, had been raised on the mainstream lies about the Holocaust and also like the rest of us, trained to abhor and shun all questioning both of the content of the stories, but even of the many uses, political and financial, to which the stories have been put.

My wife also has going for her the fact that she's Jewish (and our kids as well, at least so far as heritable rights go according to the Talmud). But she might be the only Jew I know who confesses that she knows of no relatives of hers who "died in the Holocaust" (her father immigrated with his family from Poland, while the other was in her family's first American-born generation), and she did not experience an especially religious upbringing in any case.

As she continued her denunciation of any talk of this kind, my

reeling mind (we'd been married over 25 years at the time) grappled with the question, "Why this?" Why, of all the many notions and viewpoints I'd heard her address over a quarter century of open discourse, did *this* turn out to be the ugly exception to an otherwise exceptionless record of open-minded, dispassionate consideration of many of the most incongruous, grotesque ideas conceived by the human mind?

And then, as I listened, the dam burst. It was a complete tissue of lies, supported by brainwashing! Like "they hate us for our freedom," like weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, like the Tonkin Gulf Affair, it was all of a piece! I happened already to know that it was a hard-time offense in Germany and other European countries to "deny the Holocaust," and that piece, too, fell into its rightful place with a resounding thud. I had, in fact, pursued a low-level obsession with the Holocaust for virtually my whole life, perhaps because my German uncles were both Nazis (though neither one was implicated in atrocities, and both emerged unscathed from the war despite service in the *Wehrmacht*). My dismay at my wife's misplaced outrage rose in a flash to equal hers, and then, if these things can really be compared, exceeded it.

Fortunately, I am not the confrontational sort, especially not with my wife, who outguns me several times over in the confrontation department. I decided for the time being to treat this as an illness—to study it, to seek control over its symptoms, over the long term, to apply a gentle, healthful cure for it, and above all *not* to let it lie like a napping hound from Hell.

And an illness it turned out to be in many ways, not just for my wife, but for our marriage—almost, for our family. My "career" in the correction of my lifelong study of the Holocaust had begun. I began by ordering Finkelstein's book, which itself is not revisionist at all, but which well delineates my answer to the question I have received ever since the scales fell from my eyes: "Why do you care about this so much, over sixty years after it all ended?" While I did not belabor my wife with the particulars of what I was learning, I did not conceal from her that I was learning it (we're both retired, and now spend more time together than we did in any but the earliest weeks of our relationship).

And she had many complaints about it, chief among them being what I will call "social." While she has never been one to put on airs, she is naturally sensitive to the opprobrium of those around us, and we happen to live in one of the most heavily Jewish cities outside Israel. To say that "many of our best friends are Jewish" would be an understatement, and I confess that I have not made a practice of airing my newfound understanding with each and every one of them unbidden quite yet, though I am picking them off one by one with the utmost in judiciousness. I have had to exercise discretion of this kind among my neighbors and colleagues for my whole life with regard to a long list of unconventional views, and any revisionist must have done likewise, at least if he remains today in possession of an intact body and his civil rights.

When I openly broached this taboo subject with our children (both young adults), their mother displayed the restraint that has commanded my admiration for so long: she calmly presented her reactions without attacking me or my ideas, and left it to the kids to state their minds freely, as they did, in keeping with traditions in our family that are at least as old as they are.

Our son, a fast-thinking, idealistic sort who happens to possess a world-class (and expensive, I recall) education, took up my banner almost instinctively, and even dared, as I could not dare, to wave it in his mother's face. His thinking enjoys the approval, even wonderment, of both his parents, and I saw him score points with her that she would not have countenanced (had in fact resisted) from me. Thinking is a family business with us—while we do not all think quite the same by any means, we typically do our thinking in deep and frequent consultation with each other.

Our daughter, in masterly possession herself of one of those high-priced northeastern educations, has always been more deliberate about everything, and led off with That Question that Norman Finkelstein so ably assisted me in answering with full particulars. Weighing and largely granting my points one by one, she at no point engaged her mother on any of them that had already been covered. She noted the more important fact that her mother was listening, and let that suffice, as is her temperate way. Our daughter's reaction to this, as to most things, was to let it percolate for a while and then, when as it happened she was no longer in her parents' presence, but rather in that of her friends, took the matter up with them (yes, most of them are Jewish). Friends in her generation enjoy the luxury of somewhat less emotional baggage when addressing these matters than those of my generation, despite the fact that the younger all were educated in schools in which teaching of the traditional account of the

Holocaust is now a matter of law (something our children know, and to which they give due weight, much to the detriment of the intent of the law). She found some revisionists among them (yes, among the Jews, too), and may have brought in some new ones along her way. She persuaded herself along with them, testing my arguments by using them with others.

For my part, my library has grown apace. Jostling each other for space on my desk are not only the revisionist texts by Thomas Dalton and Arthur Butz, but the "canonical" ones by Raul Hilberg and (purportedly) Rudolf Höss, and the like. David Irving is there, and Deborah Lipstadt, Richard Evans, and that whole deceitful gang right alongside his volumes.

For a while, I deployed my experience in editing Wikipedia to try to set this matter straight in its vast and widely consulted files, but there I encountered a vigilant, vigorous, and (editorially) violent "police" such as I never encountered when editing on other subjects, such as economics. Eventually, I arrived at the temporary conclusion that I might more productively employ my energies in other channels (like this article), leaving Wikipedia to stew in its own Holohoaxer juice for the time being. In the meantime, the article titled "Criticism of Holocaust Denial" utterly beggars belief, on every level. Never in all the perfervid nightmares from which George Orwell concocted *1984* did he quite succeed in contriving a slough of untruth quite like that article. Much of the rest of Wikipedia, of course, follows suit.

And what of my long-suffering Jewish wife, she of the unfailingly open mind, the keen intellect, the eloquent tongue (and pen), the penetrating insight? The outcome was foregone from the beginning. But I have learned from her the undeniable fact that it is rude and arrogant for Party A, even if he is Party B's husband, to presume, even in all good faith, to disclose Party B's mind to the world, aside entirely from the question of whether Party B even wants her mind disclosed to an ignorant, malevolent, and uncomprehending world.

Suffice it to say, peace again reigns in the Rucker household—even intellectual accord, on a good day. Dispassionate analysis again holds sway, without cavil or demurrer, and everyone is well satisfied with everyone else's intellectual integrity and perspicacity. There are, above all, no bans whatsoever on discussion of anything—anything at all.

And that's the way we like it in our family. May it be the same in your family—and *all* families, some day.

The *Führerbefehl* According to the WJC in 1945: "All Jews must die, but not before going through suffering and agony"

by Thomas Kues

In 1945, the World Jewish Congress prepared a report on the "Criminal Conspiracy" against the Jews perpetrated by the Third Reich for the authorities in charge of bringing about the International Military Tribunal. Of this report, the chapter entitled "Charge Eight: Mass Annihilation, part II" is of special interest. The document, which is found among the records of the World Jewish Congress at the Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives, can be viewed online, courtesy of the Harry S. Truman Library & Museum website, at the following address: http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistle stop/study_collections/nuremberg/documents/index.php?documentdate=1945-00-00&document tid=C107-3-9&study collectionid=&pagenumber=1

What did the World Jewish Congress in 1945 want the "international justice" to believe about the supposed Nazi extermination conspiracy? In what way did they describe the origin and the implementation of it in the form of the infamous "death camps"? What were the sources behind the report? Here I will present a brief survey of the text. On p. 109 we read:

"In March 1942, Heinrich Himmler paid a visit to Poland.

During his stay in Poland he issued an order to the effect that 50% of all Polish Jews had to be exterminated by the end of that year. In July 1942 Himmler came to Poland again. According to the Polish underground sources he declared at a Nazi meeting in Warsaw that:

> 1) Hitler had personally told him that the Jews had commenced the war and should, for that reason, be punished.
>
> 2) The Jews are the scum of the earth and must be converted to dust.
>
> 3) All Jews must die, but not before going through suffering and agony.

"A special *Vernichtungskommission* was organized, with Commissar Fey as Chairman with a large office in Warsaw. This commission had to supervise the work of Jewish extermination in Poland; its members continuously visited different parts of the country and directed the mass slaughter of the Jewish population. Chairman Fey was directly responsible to Himmler."

While the first of the three statements ascribed to Hitler is clearly based on speeches made by the Führer at the outbreak of the war, the other two statements are typical atrocity propaganda fantasies casting Hitler as the Devil incarnate. It is all too easy to picture Adolf having a tantrum in front of a sycophantic *Reichsführer-SS* while giving the infamous, never-proven *Führerbefehl* (unaware that a member of the Polish resistance, posing as a *Sachertorte*-carrying waiter, is taking mental notes). It is staggering that the WJC had the audacity to present something that sounds like a line out of a grade z horror movie as an actual statement by Hitler.

Besides, if the supposed mass exterminations of Jews were part of a "conspiracy", would it really make much sense to have a "*Vernichtungskommission*" (Extermination Committee) housed in a "large office in Warsaw"? What happened to the alleged code language? To the top secret Wannsee Conference? And who was "Commissar Fey"? Is this an error for Robert Ley, the head of the Deutsche Arbeitsfront (DAF)? No "Fey" appears on the "Preliminary List of War Criminals" drawn up by the WJC the same year; Ley does, though.

> ***The children, if healthy, were used as involuntary blood donors for the German Army. Mostly these children were bled white to such a degree that they died shortly afterwards. Special factories produced in Belzec soap and shoes out of Jewish fat; yet, this business was never really profitable, probably because of the Jews being in the third year of an acute starvation period and there was not much fat left on their bodies. [...]***

The biblical undertone of the report appears most clearly on p. 111:

"The fleeing Germans [after Stalingrad] surpassed even themselves and reached such depths of cruelty and destructive fury that they beggar any description and any imagination. The Jews should never be able to enjoy the defeat of their worst enemies, or, as Hitler put it, the Jews should never celebrate another Purim (Jewish festival commemorating defeat of Haman's plot) in his memory."

As for the Hitler quote, what the Führer actually said in this speech (according to *The New York Times* on January 31, 1944, p. 5) was that, unless Germany was victorious, "Jewry could then celebrate the destruction of Europe by a second triumphant Purim". Hitler's (reported) words were thus not a threat of physical extermination, but a warning about the consequences of a German defeat (in the *Book of Esther*, the unraveling of Haman's plot against the Jews was followed by the hanging of Haman's ten sons and the slaughter of 75,000 Persians).

The "report" gets into high gear when it reaches the description of the "death factories". Here follows the description of the supposed mass killings at Belzec (pp. 115-116):

"The Jews were crammed into special chambers with metal bars on the floor and walls; then the chambers were filled with water and a powerful electric current sent through these bars. Besides, there was in Belzec a special building with several gas chambers, and the German scientists zealously experienced [sic] there on Jews with all kinds of poisoning gases they invented or improved. The children, if healthy, were used as involuntary blood donors for the German Army. Mostly these children were bled white to such a degree that they died shortly afterwards. Special factories produced in Belzec soap and shoes out of Jewish fat; yet, this business was never really profitable, probably because of the Jews being in the third year of an acute starvation period and there

was not much fat left on their bodies. [...]

"The weak point of Belzec was the way the bodies were disposed of.… They, or their remains, were loaded on railway cars and transported to a spot where a group of Jews already prepared a grave, whereupon this whole group was instantly executed. After a few months of operating in high gear, all the fields along the railway were filled with mass graves. Lumps of gored blood and decomposed remains of human bodies were spread everywhere around the graves, and the stench became so intensive, that the peasants of nearby villages deserted their farms and land, and the whole population of Belsec left this sinister town."

Here the WJC authors try to include every ludicrous atrocity story spread about Belzec during the war: electrocution chambers, gas chambers (utilizing various unnamed poison gases), children being emptied of their blood, the human soap factory, and trains of death (the story of Jan Karski sans quicklime killings). The idea that shoes were also produced from the skins of the victims seems to be a new (but quickly forgotten) addition to Holocaust lore. No wonder, by the way, that the Belzec soap & shoes business "was never really profitable." How good would shoes made out of human fat be? Needless to say, there are no indications whatsoever that the town of Belzec was emptied of its population—rather we have ample eyewitness evidence of frequent contacts between the "death camp" and the Belzec town populace (cf. the writings of Michael Tregenza)—but apparently the spies of the underground resistance movement did not bother to verify this claim, although the town was and is easily accessible by train or car.

Next, Sobibór is briefly described (p. 116):

"In the death camp of Sobibur [sic] the process of killing was still more perfected. A special brick building was constructed there, and as soon as about 800 people passed into this building, the heavy doors were locked and an electric engine in an adjoining building pumped poison gas into it. As a rule, in fifteen minutes all the people were dead; then the floor in the building slid apart automatically and the bodies fell into the basement, from where they were taken in special carts to woods and buried there."

This description is almost certainly a summary of a testimony left on August 10, 1944 by the former Sobibór inmate Ber (Dov) Freiberg, which was later included in Vassili Grossman and Ilya Ehrenburg's *Black Book* (*Holocaust Library*, New York 1981, p. 439). The bizarre claim of the collapsible gas chamber floor appears in a number of early Sobibór testimonies.

Regarding the third Aktion Reinhardt "death camp" the report concludes that:

"Tremblinka [sic] had a much greater 'productive capacity' than Belzec or Sobibor. It had first three gas chambers, then two were added, and it was able to cope with as many as 20,000 people a day" (p. 117).

Aside from the fact that the number of added gas chambers is in contradiction with that claimed by present orthodox historiography (which have it that the new building contained either six or ten chambers), we here run into a significant paradox apparent also in the Höss "confession", namely that Auschwitz had a smaller "killing capacity" than Treblinka, despite the former being constructed as more "efficient" than the latter. On pp. 118-119 of the report we read about Auschwitz (called by its Polish name Oswiecim):

"In July 1942 Heinrich Himmler paid a visit to the camp and laid down plans how to make Oswiecim the largest death factory the Germans ever established. Four new large crematoriums, each connected with a gas-chamber, were built, able to cremate 500 people in an hour, 12,000 in a continuous work of 24 hours. And still, despite this amazing productivity, so many people were killed on some days in Oswiecim, that huge pyres of corpses had to be kindled there. Not less than 4,000,000 people perished in Oswiecim, not less than 1,800,000 of them were Jews."

Thus despite being equipped with four large crematoriums, each with its own gas chamber, the killing capacity of Auschwitz was supposedly only 60% of that of Treblinka! It is worth noting that the only victim figure of an "extermination camp" presented is that of Auschwitz. This is likely due to the fact that the victims figures attributed to the other Polish "death camps" at the time were so high—1.5 million for Majdanek, 3 million for Treblinka (Wassili Grossmann 1946), another 3 million for Belzec (the Jewish witness Rudolf Reder), and up to 2 million for Sobibor (*Dokumenty i Materialy* 1946)—that added together, they would appear to be blatantly exaggerated.

Finally we note the following statement regarding Majdanek, found on p. 118:

"On November 3rd, 1943, Majdanek had a great day: 18,400 people were killed in this single

day. In the official report sent on this day to Berlin, the camp authorities wrote: 'The difference between the number of prisoners confined in the camp in the morning and in the evening, is the result of a special annihilation of 18,000 persons.'"

This refers to the alleged so-called "Operation Harvest Festival" (*Aktion Erntefest*), a widespread massacre of Jewish workers in the Lublin district. As far as I have been able to determine, the quote from an "official report" concerning the "special annihilation" (no *Tarnsprache* used there!) is a complete fabrication on the part of either the WJC or (perhaps more likely) Soviet propagandists.

The WJC report on the "Mass Annihilation" lacks any reference to sources, while it is apparent that its authors have simply gathered their "information" more or less arbitrarily from various Polish and Soviet "reports" on alleged German war crimes. Its primary value consists in the insight it provides into the early dissemination of "Holocaust" propaganda. It beggars belief that a major international organization such as the WJC produced—at the end of the war—an unsourced "report" teeming with blatant absurdities and internal contradictions, if in fact the alleged mass extermination really had taken place. It is even more astounding that WJC officials deemed this report worthy of being submitted to international judicial authorities. This in turn shows that the men behind the "Holocaust" propaganda often did not make the effort to produce authentic-sounding or even realistic descriptions of the alleged crime; such effort was generally speaking not very necessary, since the claims were not actually tried by the "International Military Tribunal", but rather regarded as their own evidence, as far as they were found in some report submitted by the prosecution.

Elie Wiesel: "The Most Authoritative Living Witness" of The Shoah?

By Carlo Mattogno

On 27 January 2010, the tenth "Holocaust Remembrance Day", Elie Wiesel was invited into Montecitorio Hall, the seat of the Chamber of Deputies of the Italian Republic where he had the opportunity to give a brief speech. The president of the Chamber, Gianfranco Fini, introduced him as "the most authoritative living witness of the horrors of the Shoah among the survivors of the Nazi concentration camps". [1] But is he really a witness?

Is Elie Wiesel an impostor?

On 3 March 2009, a Hungarian website published an article entitled "Még mindig kísérti a haláltábor" (The extermination camp is still tempting) [2] and outlining important revelations by Miklós Grüner, a former deportee to Auschwitz. The article was translated and appeared the following day under the title "Auschwitz Survivor Claims Elie Wiesel Is an Impostor" [3]. The text reads as follows:

"In May 1944 , when Miklos Gruner was 15, he was deported from Hungary to Auschwitz-Birkenau with his mother and father as well as both a younger and an elder brother. He says that his mother and his younger brother were immediately gassed after their arrival in the camp. Then he, his elder brother and their father had an inmate number tattooed on their arms and were sent to perform hard work in a synthetic fuel factory linked to IG Farben where the father died six months later. After that, the elder brother was sent to Mauthausen and, as the young Miklos was then alone, two elder Jewish inmates who were also Hungarians and friends with his late father took him under their protection. These two protectors of the young Miklos were the Lazar and Abraham Wiesel brothers.

"In the following months, Miklos Gruner and the Wiesel brothers became good friends. Lazar Wiesel was 31 years old in 1944. Miklos never forgot the number Lazar was tattooed with by the Nazis: A-7713. In January 1945, as the Russian army was coming, the inmates were transferred to Buchenwald. During the ten days this transfer took, partly by foot, partly by train, more

than half of the inmates died and amongst them was Abraham, the elder brother of Lazar Wiesel. In April 8, 1945, the US army liberated Buchenwald. Miklos and Lazar were amongst the survivors of the camp. As Miklos had tuberculosis, he was sent in a Swiss clinic and therefore was separated from Lazar. After recovering, Miklos emigrated to Australia while his elder brother, who also survived the war, established himself in Sweden.

"Years later, in 1986, Miklos was contacted by the Swedish journal Sydsvenska Dagbladet in Malmo and invited to meet 'an old friend' named Elie Wiesel.… As Miklos answered that he doesn`t know anyone with this name, he was told Elie Wiesel was the same person Miklos knew in the Nazi camps under the name Lazar Wiesel and with the inmate number A-7713.… Miklos still remembered that number and he was therefore convinced at that point that he was going to meet his old friend Lazar and happily accepted the invitation to meet him at the Savoj Hotel in Stockholm on December 14, 1986. Miklos recalls:

"'I was very happy at the idea of meeting Lazar but when I confronted the so-called "Elie Wiesel", I was stunned to see a man I didn`t recognize at all, who didn`t even speak Hungarian or Yiddish and instead he was speaking English in a strong French accent. Therefore our meeting was over in about ten minutes. As a goodbye gift, the man gave me his book entitled "Night" of which he claimed to be the author. I accepted the book I didn`t know at that time but told everyone there that this man was not the person he pretended to be!'

"Miklos recalls that during this strange meeting, Elie Wiesel refused to show him the tattooed number on his arm, saying he didn`t want to exhibit his body. Miklos adds that Elie Wiesel showed his tattooed number afterward to an Israeli journalist who Miklos met and this journalist told Miklos that he didn`t have time to identify the number but … was certain it wasn`t a tattoo. Miklos says:

"'After that meeting with Elie Wiesel, I spent twenty years of research and found out that the man calling himself Elie Wiesel has never been in a Nazi concentration camp since he was not included in any official list of detainees'.

"Miklos also found out that the book Elie Wiesel gave him in 1986 as something he has written himself was in fact written in Hungarian in 1955 by Miklos' old friend Lazar Wiesel and published in Paris under the title 'Un di Velt hot Gesvigen', meaning approximately 'The World Kept Silent'. The book was then shortened and rewritten in French as well as in English in order to be published under the author`s name Elie Wiesel in 1958, under the French title 'La Nuit' and the English title 'Night'. Ten million copies of the book were sold in the world by Elie Wiesel who even received a Nobel Peace prize for it in 1986 while – says Miklos – the real author Lazar Wiesel was mysteriously missing.…

"'Elie Wiesel never wanted to meet me again', says Miklos. 'He became very successful; he takes 25 thousand dollars for a 45 minutes speech on the Holocaust. I have officially reported to the FBI in Los Angeles. I have also complained to governments and media, in the US and Sweden with no result.

"'I have received anonymous calls telling me I could be shot if I don`t shut up but I am not afraid of death any more. I have deposited the whole dossier in four different countries and, if I died suddenly, they would be made public. The world must know that Elie Wiesel is an impostor and I am going to tell it, I am going to publish the truth in a book called "Stolen Identity A7713".'"

Miklós Grüner's declarations have been repeated many times, but have not caused any major research effort. We will thus scrutinize them critically but soberly.

This article was first published on 26 March in *Inconvenient History: An Independent Revisionist Blog* http://www.revblog.codoh.com /2010/03/elie-wiesel-new-documents/

This is the text and format of the ad that is running in the Volante at University of South Dakota. See page 16 of this Report.

THE GAS CHAMBER OF SHERLOCK HOLMES
by Samuel Crowell
Full text of the book is here

DOGMA, DOUBLE STANDARDS AND DOUBT

Continued from page 2

against scrutiny "by taboos and media witch trials." Anyone who doubts receives the prescribed rabbinical punishment—"public disgrace and financial ruin."

Thirty years of such organized hysteria have conditioned Smith to expect anything but a debate on the points of contention that separate revisionists from proponents of the orthodox version of the Holocaust. His opponents never disappoint him. When he asks for substantiation of the mass gassing thesis he is asked, "Why do you defend Nazis? How can you justify Hitler? Why does it matter to you how the Jews were murdered?" When he points out the ludicrous nature of the claims that are taken seriously about homicidal gas chambers, he is told not to focus on them: "It's not the gas chambers that are important. What's important is the fact that the Jews were murdered. There are so many more important issues." When he persists in focusing on facts, he is psychoanalyzed: "What are your motives? Your real motives?" When he stands up for intellectual freedom, it is contemptuously dismissed: "Free speech? Don't try to put us on about free speech. What did the Jews ever do to you?" Discussion, debate, intellectual exchange, all are completely irrelevant: "We don't care about your fantasy about how there are no proofs that the gas chambers existed. We're past that. We know they existed. We want to know why you do it. Why the gas chambers? Why the Holocaust? Why the Jews?"

Charges of anti-Semitism are particularly easy to refute in Smith's case. He concedes that the German National Socialist state singled out Jews for special and cruel treatment, that they were stripped of their rights, forcibly relocated to ghettos, conscripted for labor, dispossessed of their property, and deported from the countries of their birth. He acknowledges that large numbers of them perished in awful conditions presided over by the Nazis. "In short," he says, "Jewish culture in Eastern Europe was destroyed during the Hitlerian regime." Such are the thoughts of what the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith calls one of the most dangerously racist men in America.

"Those who hate or believe they do," he writes, are in a struggle with their inner lives, as we all are. Projecting the struggle out into institutions and political movements is what leads to the violence, not the feelings themselves." This stance encourages Smith to gloss over important distinctions and give too much importance to his personal dislikes, which have no bearing on historical events.

One weakness of Smith's work is its "spiritual" orientation and the uncritical anti-Communist bias that accompanies it. Smith judges historical events to be the product of "hate" projected onto human institutions, not of a clash of interests objectively in conflict. "Those who hate or believe they do," he writes, "are in a struggle with their inner lives, as we all are. Projecting the struggle out into institutions and political movements is what leads to the violence, not the feelings themselves." This stance encourages Smith to gloss over important distinctions and give too much importance to his personal dislikes, which have no bearing on historical events.

Responding to the horrendous 911 attacks on the U.S., Smith issues a blanket condemnation against widely disparate political figures for engaging in "violence":

"With respect to killing the innocent for the acts of those who rule them, the Islamist radicals did nothing unusual. They represent an old established human tradition. They want to right what, from their point of view, are the injustices being carried out against 'their' people. That's what they all say. Hitler said it. Stalin said it. Pol Pot and Idi Amin said it. Even Che Guevarra (sic) and the pipsqueak Fidel Castro said it. They all were willing to intentionally kill the innocent for what they convinced themselves was a 'higher good.' The people who did the World Trade Centers were unique only in that they represented no nation state, but an NGO, a non-governmental organization."

What is interesting about this commentary is that it omits mention of Palestinian violence. Smith cannot be unaware of the long train of kidnappings, shootings, bombings, hijackings, and general war carried out by the PLO and Hamas.

But unlike in the case of Marxist-inspired movements, he omits mention of it. Why? Because, as Smith repeatedly points out, Israel is to blame for establishing an apartheid state on Palestinian land and brutally expelling as many of the indigenous inhabitants as possible, actions that make such a "terrorist" response, if not inevitable, certainly highly predictable. In other words, he puts the blame where it belongs—on the actions of the oppressor, not on the desperate measures of the oppressed to fight back. This is as it should be, and Smith should do the same vis-a-vis other oppressed groups, whether they be Nicaraguan, Cuban, Chinese, Russian, Korean, or Vietnamese.

After all, none of the figures Smith indicts above would likely accept that their policy was to "intentionally kill the innocent," and therefore it is up to each and every one of us to rationally evaluate what they actually did, rather than dismiss them as heartless mass murderers on some "spiritual" pretext. Smith prefers to ignore the distinction between oppressor and oppressed and issue a blanket indictment against both groups for engaging in "violence." But this sheds no light on history, which, after all, is a secular process, nor does it address the issue of what oppressed majorities should do to escape the brutal conditions institutionalized violence imposes on them. For such people, the issue is not hatred, but desperation. Smith nowhere addresses their plight.

For Smith, "the initiation of violence is the overriding issue." The problem with this orientation is that it overlooks the fact that violence is seamlessly integrated into all the dominant institutions of capitalist society, making it quite impossible to determine the "initiation" of violence. Under capitalism it is permissible to exclude millions of people from access to clean water, adequate food, medical care, and other basic necessities, resulting in countless unnecessary deaths. Capitalist propagandists insist this is not violence, but that a social movement dedicated to changing these priorities by displacing capitalist elites by force is violence. This is a starkly ideological definition that Smith does not bother to inspect. In fact, he uncritically supports it.

Furthermore, Smith, like Holocaust revisionists in general, is far too credulous in believing fantastical claims about socialist or Communist atrocities, whether real or imagined.

Furthermore, Smith, like Holocaust revisionists in general, is far too credulous in believing fantastical claims about socialist or Communist atrocities, whether real or imagined. Consider this episode Smith relates from the 1980s: "In Mother Jones there's a photograph of a Nicaraguan girl with the stump of one leg wrapped in bandages. Some progressive-forces group is using the photo as anti-Contra propaganda. The one-legged girl is laughing and the propagandists are asking for money. These are the same folks who did not take photographs of the one-legged girls manufactured by the Sandinistas when the Sandinistas were guerrillas . . . .their own politics are more important to them than the one-legged girls."

Here Smith uncritically equates the Contras and the Sandinistas as "guerrillas" dedicated to "manufacturing" mutilated children in the pursuit of political goals. But is this true? The Contras, composed overwhelmingly of ex-Somoza National Guardsmen famous for torture, rape, and murder, were an imperial mercenary army, never a guerrilla force, and they had no indigenous support inside Nicaragua. Their leaders were wealthy Somocistas who were given $84,000 tax-free every year by Washington to deliberately target civilians for torture and murder. There was no comparable Sandinista loyalty and policy, before or after the revolution. In fact, during the guerrilla phase the Sandinistas won the loyalty of the overwhelming majority of the population by "violent" actions against high-value political enemies, not against civilians in general. After the revolution they abolished the death penalty rather than execute the men who would later form the Contras. So if the Sandinistas were "manufacturing" one-legged girls, how does one account for their overwhelming popularity at the time among the Nicaraguan people? In fact, Smith's claim is simply untrue.

Smith is similarly dismissive of FMLN "violence" during the war in El Salvador from 1979 to 1994, when a U.S.-sponsored death-squad government (Salvadorian death squads were created by the C.I.A. during the Kennedy Administration) killed roughly 70,000 people, often after hideous torture, the vast majority of them civilians. Nonetheless, after reading a newspaper article about a priest in El Salvador who had joined the guerrillas, Smith characterized the situation as follows: "So the priest is going to bless the people who are killing the people for the good of the people. The usual." He neglects to point out that the people were the ones who

took up arms to protect themselves against death squads created by Smith's government in Washington, and that the priest was therefore blessing these efforts at self-defense, not exercises in wanton killing, as Smith's "spiritual" distortion would have us believe.

"I ought never to initiate force against another person to get something I want," writes Smith in his book, *The Man Who Saw His Own Liver*. He seems not to realize that this precept has no application in the lives of the hundreds of millions or perhaps billions of people who do not have the luxury of wondering what a "want" is, so preoccupied are they with securing that which they desperately need to keep death at bay for themselves and their children. (Recall that psychologist Abraham Maslow's famous hierarchy of human motivation deals with needs, not wants.) If they pick up a gun to protect themselves against the imperial armies and C.I.A. goon squads sent to repress and kill them, in Smith's eyes they are just as guilty of "violence" as their enemies in Washington. But this is like saying that the surgeon who cuts you open to remove a diseased organ is no better than the gangbanger who knifes you in order to steal your wallet. In fact, given the vastly greater killing carried out by imperial armies as compared to guerrilla forces, it's a lot worse than saying this.

Smith states that "the Holocaust story increasingly reads like the greatest, most successful PR campaign of the 20th century." If this is true, and it is not difficult to credit, then belief in Communism as a satanic and even more murderous force than Nazism has to be a close second. After all, from the moment of its triumph the Bolshevik revolution was hysterically smeared, accused by the capitalist press of engineering deliberate starvation, massacre, sexual communism, and hideous refinement of unspeakable torture. Bolshevik leaders were denounced as assassins and lunatics, human scum, criminals by nature, and beasts. The fledgling Soviet Union was depicted as a land of raving maniacs forcing hapless peasants to fight over carrion with dogs.

At the same time, in the eagerness to equate Marxism with Satanism, Communist social gains have been routinely screened out of capitalist news coverage.

Testifying before the Congressional Overman Committee in 1919 U.S. Ambassador to Moscow David Francis claimed the Bolsheviks were killing everyone "who wears a white collar or who is educated and who is not a Bolshevik." Madame Katherine Breshkovskaya, a famous anti-Bolshevik militant, testified that in one year of Bolshevik rule twice as many Russian men, women, and children had been killed as Russian soldiers were lost at the front during all of World War I. Other witnesses swore the revolutionary army was made up of criminals and Jews transplanted from New York's Lower East Side. Still others insisted promiscuity was running amok, with women nationalized and roped into "free love" bureaus. The bed-hopping Bolsheviks were also alleged to be roasting their political enemies in furnaces, scalding them with steam, dismembering them on racks and hacking them to pieces with axes. Sound familiar?

The following year (1920) Charles Merz and Walter Lippmann published their study of *New York Times* coverage of the Bolshevik Revolution, characterizing it as "nothing short of a disaster." Far from basing its views on fact, the Newspaper of Record had shamelessly promoted stories "dominated by the hopes of the men who composed the news organization." Accordingly, the Bolsheviks schizophrenically appeared in the Times' coverage as both "cadaver and world-wide menace," depending on the imperialist needs of the moment.

"The news about Russia is a case of seeing not what was, but what men wished to see," observed Merz and Lippmann. "The chief censor and the chief propagandist were hope and fear in the minds of reporters and editors." Fabrication was routine: The *Times* cited fictional atrocities, repeatedly claimed the Bolshevik government was at the point of collapse, and spread panic about an imaginary threat of armed revolution inside the United States.

The *Times*' newsmen were guilty of a "boundless credulity, an untiring readiness to be gulled, and on many occasions a downright lack of common sense." Their contributions to public understanding at a time of world crisis have been "about as useful as that of an astrologer or an alchemist."

"For subjective reasons," Lippman and Merz went on, the staff "accepted and believed most of what they were told" by the U.S. government and "the agents and adherents of the old regime." With the USSR reduced to starvation and ruin they mocked Soviet leaders' peace offers as Bolshevik subterfuge designed to "concentrate their energies for a renewed drive to-

ward world-wide revolution," starting with a "Red invasion of Europe" that somehow never materialized.

At the same time, in the eagerness to equate Marxism with Satanism Communist social gains have been routinely screened out of capitalist news coverage. The dramatic gains in literacy, industrial wages, health care, and women's rights that characterized the Stalin period are very rarely mentioned when the USSR is being discussed. It is considered axiomatic that "socialism doesn't work," so the idea that revolutionary communism actually created a better life for the mass of people (in Eastern Europe, Russia, China, Mongolia, North Korea, and Cuba) than the miserable existence that preceded it under feudal lords, military bosses, foreign colonizers, and Western capitalists, simply cannot be entertained no matter what the facts are.

In China, where the 1949 revolution unified the country and ultimately ended mass starvation, the social gains of the Communist period were quite marked. According to work published by Nobel –I Prize–winning economist Amartya Sen (and his associate Jean Dreze) in 1989, "Chinese efforts have been quite spectacular," but dramatic gains in raising life expectancy and quality of life levels came abruptly to an end in 1979 when market-based reforms were implemented and "the downward trend in mortality [in China was] at least halted, and possibly reversed." The results were "particularly severe" for women and female children. After 1979, there was "a steady decline in the female-male ratio in the population" and a two year decline in female life expectancy, after a period of steady growth in the pro-reform period.

Meanwhile, in neighboring capitalist India, Sen and Dreze reported, Indian death rates were even higher than in China during the famine attending the Great Leap Forward, an event that resulted in somewhere between 16.5 million and 29.5 million people starving to death, the authors conclude. Nevertheless, "as far as morbidity, mortality, and longevity are concerned, China has a decisive lead over India." Between 1949 (the year of the revolution) and 1979 "China . . . achieved a remarkable transition in health and nutrition," while "no comparable transformation has occurred in India." Therefore, as of 1979, "the life of the average Chinese has tended to be much more secure than that of the average Indian." If India had adopted China's social programs, "there would have been about 3.8 million fewer deaths a year around the middle of the 1980s." The authors do not shy away from the obvious conclusion: "That indicates that every eight years or so more people in addition die in India—in comparison with Chinese mortality rates—than the total number that died in the gigantic Chinese famine." In short, India in its experiment with democratic capitalism starting in 1947 caused more deaths than all those attributed to Communist states in the whole world after 1917—over 100 million by 1949—and tens of millions more in the last three decades.

How often does this conclusion reach a mass audience in the United States? Has it ever reached Bradley Smith? And where are the *New York Times* headlines screaming of a capitalist murder machine running amok?

The point is that claims about tens of millions of people being deliberately murdered are very often ideological exercises designed to demonize or otherwise discredit selected enemies of capitalist empire. Therefore, stories of Communist "gulags" and deliberate Marxist mass-murder campaigns should be taken with a very large grain of salt. They are all too similar to stories of soap made from Jewish cadavers and lampshades made of human skin.

Sources:

Bradley R. Smith, *Break His Bones: The Private Life of a Holocaust Revisionist* (Bradley R. Smith, 2002)

Bradley R. Smith, *The Man Who Saw His Own Liver* (Nine-Banded Books, 2008)

Michael Parenti, *Blackshirts & Reds: Rational Fascism & The Overthrow of Communism* (City Lights, 1997)

Noam Chomsky, *Rogue States: The Rule of Force in World Affairs* (South End, 2000)

Robert K. Murray, *Red Scare: A Study in National Hysteria, 1917-1920* (University of Minnesota, 1955)

Murray B. Levin, *Political Hysteria in America: The Democratic Capacity for Repression* (Basic Books, 1971)

Robert Justin Goldstein, *Political Repression in Modern America* (Schenkman, 1978)

Peter G. Filene, ed., *American Views of Soviet Russia, 1917-1965* (Dorsey Press, 1968)

Interview with Allan Nairn, "Democracy Now," June 8, 2004

--Michael K. Smith is the author of Portraits of Empire *and* The Madness of King George *(illustrations by Matt Wuerker), from Common Courage Press.*

This article was first published at **legalienate** http://legal ienate.blogspot.com/

THE CAMPUS PROJECT

The online edition of the *Volante*, the student newspaper at University of South Dakota, has been running a CODOH banner ad for the last week. The ad reads:

The Gas Chamber of
Sherlock Holmes
by Samuel Crowell.
Full text of the book is *here*.

The ad appears on the front page of the *Volante* and the front page of each of the other sections to the paper, including News, Sports, Opinion, Blogs and Verve, a cultural "magazine." As it states in the ad, one click of the mouse and you have the entire book.

Sherlock is remarkable, in a class by itself. It is very hard for Blind Believers, especially those in academia, to address Crowell. The text is online at http://www.codoh.com/incon/inconshr123.html

An ad with a different text is running in the *Titan* at California State University-Fullerton. This ad reads:

The Irrational Vocabulary of
the Professorial Class …

The two lines together are a link, taking the reader to the talk I gave in Tehran on 06 December 2006 titled "The Irrational Vocabulary of the Professorial Class with Regard to the Holocaust Question."

The same ad began running today at U California-San Francisco in the *Synapse* as a text link. This is the same very small format that was in place in the *Badger Herald* at U Wisconsin-Madison and caused such a fire storm of condemnation and publicity for revisionist arguments.

And only today we learned that the online edition of the *Maroon*, University of Chicago, will begin running "The Irrational Vocabulary …" as a banner.

In short, this is a rather brilliant tack we have taken here (how did it happen to me?). Working with a technology that tens of thousands of students and others—not just at specific university campuses but anywhere in the world—can access revisionist arguments that are breaking through the taboo meant to destroy us. The taboo that allows the Holocaust narrative to be exploited to morally justify a politics and a cultural establishment based on fraud, conformity, and a crazy greed for influence and money.

In one sense it is the same story over and over again. The taboo against a free exchange of ideas regarding the Holocaust question, the effort to pierce the taboo. The successes, the failures, repeating themselves year after year. I can understand how it would become boring to some.

Then there are the statistics. When I Google "Holocaust revisionism" on the Internet I find 233,000 references. Goggling "Holocaust denial" I find 580,000 references. When I first got into this business (which is not a business, unfortunately) such figures were beyond the imagination of any of us. It is the everyday work, much of it repetitious and ineffective, that has produced these numbers, everyday work that so many of us are committed to, are willing to stay with, no matter that a good part of it is mere drudgery, trench work.

This in turn suggests a question. Why am I still interested in this work? What's wrong with me? I don't have the space to work it out here, but I think I am going to think about it. Maybe it will make an interesting story.

Meanwhile, here I am. There are the expenses. The everyday expenses, the exceptional expenses. The expenses. For all of you who continue to support me and this work—your reward will be in heaven (to coin a phrase).

Thank you.

Bradley

Smith's Report
is published by
Committee for
Open Debate
on the Holocaust

Bradley R. Smith, Founder

For your contribution of $39
you will receive 12 issues of
Smith's Report.
Canada and Mexico--$45
Overseas--$49

Letters and Donations to:
Bradley R. Smith
Post Office Box 439016
San Ysidro, CA 92143

Desk: 209 682 5327
Email:
bradley1930@yahoo.com